



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,092	07/23/2001	David B. Crosbie	3180.1001-001	4017
51414	7590	01/27/2006	EXAMINER	
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP PATENT ADMINISTRATOR EXCHANGE PLACE BOSTON, MA 02109-2881			WANG, LIANG CHE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/911,092	Applicant(s) CROSBIE, DAVID B.	
	Examiner Liang-che Alex Wang	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/30/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Paper Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:
3. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received on 9/30/2005 is considered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

- a. That: Ramasubramani teaches away from including user-specific data (both device identifier and user identifier) in the request (pages 8 and 10, remark).

This is found not persuasive because Ramasubramani in Col 8 lines 45-49 states "... matching the device ID 316 in the request from the mobile device 302 and the stored ID of the account 320...". This shows device ID 316 is in the request as claimed, and is used to match with ID stored in 320, not 318.

Ramasubramani in Col 6 lines 62-63, discloses "the device ID 316 is further associated with a subscriber ID 318", and in Col 7 lines 10-11 states "the account 324, indexed by the device ID 316 or the subscriber ID 318." It is clear both

device ID and subscriber ID (user ID) could be included in a request to index an account.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramasubramani et al., hereinafter Ramasubramani.
8. Referring to claim 1, Ramasubramani teaches a method for authorizing access by a user to a resource (see title and figure 2) over a wireless local area network (Col 4 lines 52-64), comprising the steps of:
- a. setting access privileges to the resource (setting a user account corresponds to setting access privilege to resource) for a cluster of users (subscribers are a cluster of users) of the wireless local area network (Col 8 lines 29-33, setting subscriber account is inherent since user accounts are required to access information);
 - b. receiving a request from a device controlled by the user to access the resource over the wireless local area network (Col 9 lines 8-14), the user having a membership in the cluster (subscriber), and the request including a user identifier

for the user (item 318 in figure 3) and a device identifier for the device (item 316) making the request (Col 9 lines 8-47);

c. locating access privileges based on the device identifier (item 316), the user identifier (item 318), and the cluster (subscriber is member of a cluster)(Col 9 lines 10-18); and

d. authorizing a session between the device and the resource based on the located access privileges (Col 9 lines 42-47).

9. Referring to claims 2 and 3, claims 2 and 3 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 3 are rejected for the same reason as the claim 1.

10. Referring to claim 4, Ramasubramani teaches a method for managing context information for a wireless local area network, comprising the steps of:

a. receiving a request to access the resource over the wireless local area network, the request including a device identifier for a device making the request (Col 9 lines 8-47);

b. locating context information (certificate) associated with the device identifier, the context information having been assigned to the device during a previous session between the device and the resource and including access privileges associated with a cluster of users (Col 4 lines 29-36); and

c. providing the context information to the device for use in a current session between the device and the resource (figure 4B; Col 4 lines 29-36).

11. Referring to claim 5, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the wireless local area network is based on a radio frequency suitable for use in local wireless communications (Col 4 lines 59-64).
12. Referring to claim 6, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein communications over the wireless local area network are based on a spread-spectrum technique based on a carrier frequency greater than about 2,000 megahertz (Col 4 lines 59-64).
13. Referring to claim 7, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the device identifier is a unique identification number (Col 6 line 67- Col 7 line 1).
14. Referring to claim 8, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the context information includes an internet protocol address (see item 368 in figure 4B) assigned to the device in the previous secure session (Col 4 lines 29-36);.
15. Referring to claim 9, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the access privileges associated with a cluster of user was for the cluster in a previous request to access the resource (see figure 4B).
16. Referring to claim 10, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the device is a voice-enabled communications device (item 106, figure 2), and the gateway server (item 114) is adapted for voice-enabled network communications (Col 4 line 66- Col 5 line 3).
17. Referring to claims 11-18 claims 11-18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 4-10. Therefore, claims 11-18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 4-10.


Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2155

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang *LW*
January 19, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER